### Directions

One debater is yellow, the other is blue. Read the speech as smoothly as you can, alternating voices back and forth.

### Inherency

#### Contention One - Inherency

#### In negotiations over a Bilateral Investment Treaty, China seeks CFIUS reforms. But, the US won’t change its stance in the status quo.

Moran ‘15

Dr. Theodore H. Moran holds the Chair in International Business and Finance at the School of Foreign Service, *Georgetown University*, where he teaches and conducts research at the intersection of international economics, business, foreign affairs, and public policy. Dr. Moran is founder of the Landegger Program in International Business Diplomacy, and serves as Director in providing courses on international business-government relations and negotiations. Dr. Moran is consultant to the United Nations, to diverse governments in Asia and Latin America and received his PhD from Harvard. “Chinese Investment and CFIUS: Time for an Updated (and Revised) Perspective” - Policy Brief: NUMBER PB15-17 – Peterson Institute for International Economics – September - https://piie.com/publications/pb/pb15-17.pdf

For more than a decade, China has complained about what it maintains has been a pattern of erratic and politicized treatment of Chinese investors when they attempt to acquire US companies- Chinese authorities remain stung in particular by the political backlash in Washington provoked in 2005 when the China National Offshore Oil Corporation (CNOOC) attempted unsuccessfully to acquire the American oil company Unocal. Although the deal was aborted by politics, and not any official finding of security concerns, the Chinese have targeted the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) as a focus of their criticism. The Chinese want the committee, an interagency group that reviews foreign acquisitions of US companies for possible threats to the national security of the United States, to be more open and transparent in its rulings and to not discriminate against Chinese firms but instead treat Chinese acquisitions on an equal basis in comparison with acquisitions by firms of other nationalities. The United States is not likely to accede to the Chinese demands in any formal or legal manner. In a world of geopolitical tensions, acquisitions by firms from potential adversary countries will inevitably receive disproportionately intense scrutiny. Assessments by US intelligence agencies will remain secret so as not to reveal "sources and methods." Discussions with the Chinese about addressing their demands have been a major part of negotiations on a bilateral investment treaty (BIT), but as of September 2015, progress on the issue has stalled despite efforts to complete agreement at the time of the visit of President Xi Jinping to Washington and Seattle. It has become increasingly apparent that the United States is not prepared to change CFIUS's substantive procedures as China wants.

### Relations Advantage

#### Contention Two - Relations

#### Absent change, US-Sino ties will spiral to great power conflict in the short-term – a BIT is *the most important variable* to solve.

Zhang ‘15

Chin Chin Zhang is a M.A. candidate for International Trade & Investment Policy at George Washington University's Elliott School of International Affairs in 2016. Her study integrates the political, economic and financial dynamics of global currents, with regional focuses on the United States, European Union and China. She worked in the financial services industry while earning her B.S. in Applied Mathematics from University of California-Los Angeles – From the article - “In Response: Simple Ingredients for the Sino-American Partnership” - International Affairs Review - Volume XXIII, Number 3 • Summer 2015 – available at: http://www.iar-gwu.org/sites/default/files/articlepdfs/China%20Special%20Issue%20DOC%20C%20-%2003%20Simple%20Ingredients%20-%20Zhang.pdf

Whenever interests between states get convoluted, scholars seize the opportunity to march ambitiously toward long-term relationship-building. They do so under the assumption that the best way to avoid great-power conflict is by emphasizing mutual interests in the long run. Unfortunately, too forward-looking an approach can easily diverge from the core issues at present, yielding ankle-deep analyses, biased standpoints, and vulnerable arguments. Florick and Cronkleton's "Remapping China-United States Relations" offers hopeful cooperative ventures rather than pragmatic solutions to prevent a negative spiral in Sino-American relations. The authors fashion opportunities for collaboration in the defense and social realms to diversify the existing economics-heavy approach and to reduce mistrust. Yet the measures put forward by the authors do not factor in Beijing's perspective and often demand total concession from China. Despite their optimistic vision across defense, economic, and social issues across different timeframes, the authors fail to acknowledge China's strategic priorities. In radical contrast to the well-briefed U.S. strategic priorities from the 2015 National Security Strategy, China's strategic priorities are only "broadly spoken" as to "defend sovereignty, maintain territorial integrity and support development" - a very incomplete summary. China's latest national security document states Chinese diplomatic priorities as, in order of importance: "Collaborate with Russia (Kflfe), Attract the EU (fegfc), Calm the US. The strategy identifies China's top national security concern as "the U.S.-led Western attitude on China's domestic policies, territorial dispute and ocean rights."2 The low priority assigned to the United States on China's diplomatic agenda contrasts with its top position as a defense priority. This evidences Beijing's defensive stance toward a distrusted Washington, a stance that cannot be addressed by merely peripheral mutual interests. First and foremost, ongoing terrorism and territorial disputes challenge both nations' priorities. For China, sovereignty issues reign supreme, while the United States is more concerned with terrorism and the stability of the international order. Florick and Cronkleton argue that China should join counter-terrorism operations against the Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS), reasoning that Beijing may face a direct future threat from returning fighters. The scenario is not far-fetched, as Beijing was informed by Israel last year that about a thousand Uighurs had joined ISIS.3 Yet China will have little interest in cooperative counter-terrorism efforts until the threat manifests - and may believe that cooperating with those very efforts will make it an immediate target. In August 2014, President Obama labeled China a "free-rider" in the Middle East.4 To the Chinese public, such a label exaggerated China's economic prowess and downplayed Beijing's contribution in the post-war reconstruction effort in Iraq. Regardless of Obama's true intention-perceived disrespect is enough to insulate trust. To move forward. Washington could initiate an open conversation with Beijing, express hopes of further cooperation in the Middle East, recognize China's past contributions in the region, and offer future cooperation on combating terrorism aimed at China. Similar problems plague the authors' identification of Chinese territorial disputes for short-term resolution possibilities. The authors suggest establishing a "quota system for naval and aerial incursions and a moratorium on personnel landings on the disputed territories off China's coast." This is an entirely U.S.-centric view absent recognition of China's historical governance of the South China Sea that dates back to 210 BC a fact that equals "effective governance" under international law.6 No other issue is more pertinent to Chinese sovereignty than the South China Sea dispute. If the United States desires shared leadership with China, it should maintain a neutral position on South China Sea issues to avoid unnecessary damage to mutual trust. In contrast to the defense and political spheres, economic factors are so far the most-developed aspect of the U.S.-China relationship. Massive trade flows already bond the two parties' interests despite disputes in other arenas. The authors caution against weighting the relationship too heavily toward economic ties, but fail to realize that bilateral trade and investment issues hold the greatest potential for mutually beneficial partnership opportunities. Moving forward, both parties need to constantly adjust public-private dynamics to better meet market needs and accommodate firms from the other state within relevant legal frameworks. In the outlook for trade and investment, two general challenges remain, the larger of which is protectionist policies. The authors suggest that the United States and China "increase transparency and openness in business-government relationships and lift protectionist tactics in the interests of cooperation and building good will." This echoes the current trend in Sino-American relations. A Bilateral Investment Treaty (BIT), initiated in June 2014 and completed in March 2015, agrees to provide protections for the other country's foreign investors.7 If the BIT transitions from paper to reality, China will attract increased foreign direct investment and reduce its heavy reliance on manufacturing exports and debt-financed investment, while the United States could further penetrate the Chinese market and even gain early stakes in a liberalized financial market envisioned in Xi's reform agenda. The United States needs to smooth concerns over its loss of domestic employment, while China needs to take serious measures to ensure fairness to foreign investors with the exact set of rules and protections agreed upon in the BIT.

#### Relations are nearing a tipping point - US-Sino ties are key to *check military encounters*, *coop on transnational issues*; and *economic welfare in both nations*.

Lampton ‘15

Dr. David M. Lampton is The Director of China Studies at the Johns Hopkins Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS) and Chair of The Asia Foundation. *In January 2015 Lampton was named the most influential China watcher by the Institute of International Relations at the China Foreign Affairs University in Beijing. Researchers chose him after assessing the credentials of 158 top China experts.* Lampton is the Former President of the National Committee on United States-China Relations and is currently a member of the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations Executive Committee and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. He received his B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. degrees from Stanford University. This is a transcript of Dr. Lampton’s speech titled: “A Tipping Point in U.S.-China Relations is Upon Us” as given at the conference “China’s Reform: Opportunities and Challenges.” This event was co-hosted by The Carter Center and the Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences over May 6-7, 2015. Available via the US-China Perception Monitor - http://www.uscnpm.org/blog/2015/05/11/a-tipping-point-in-u-s-china-relations-is-upon-us-part-i/

Today, soon after May 4th and in the context of the 70th anniversary of the end of WWII, the question is whether or not America and China can, again, find such vision and leadership in today’s far different circumstances. My purpose in the frank remarks to follow is not to depress or offend, but rather to motivate all of us to push events in a better, more mutually beneficial direction. My spirit is at one with Minister Li’s exhortation that we “amplify what we have in common.” For eight U.S. and five Chinese administrations, Washington and Beijing maintained remarkable policy continuity—broadly speaking, constructive engagement. This continuity has persisted despite periodic instabilities, problems, and crises. Some of these developments required time, flexibility, and wisdom to heal. They sometimes left scar tissue. But, none of these challenges ever destroyed overall assessments in both our nations that we each had fundamental, shared interests requiring cooperation and that the costs of conflict outweighed possible gains. Assessments of relative power in both countries for much of the last four decades created few incentives in either society to rethink fundamental policy. Chinese seemingly were resigned to “live with the hegemon,” as one respected Chinese professor put it, and Americans were secure in their dominance and preoccupied with conflicts elsewhere. After the 9/11 attacks on America, China was seen as non-threatening, indeed willing to use some of its resources in the “War on Terror.” In a reflective moment after the 9/11 attacks, then Ambassador to China Sandy Randt delivered a speech to Johns Hopkins–SAIS in which he said, “We have seen the enemy, and it is not China.” In the economic realm, expectations for growth in each society created common interests that subordinated many underlying frictions, whether economic or human rights. The positive balance between hope and fear tipped behavior toward restraint and patience. Things unfortunately have changed dramatically since about 2010. The tipping point is near. Our respective fears are nearer to outweighing our hopes than at any time since normalization. We are witnessing the erosion of some critical underlying supports for predominantly positive U.S.-China ties. Though the foundation has not crumbled, today important components of the American policy elite increasingly are coming to see China as a threat to American “primacy.” In China, increasing fractions of the elite and public see America as an impediment to China’s achieving its rightful international role and not helpful to maintaining domestic stability. Former Australian Prime Minister Kevin Rudd put it well, characterizing the narrative of an unidentified Chinese Communist Party document [perhaps the new National Security Blue Book], and analogous American thinking, in the following terms: “In Beijing’s eyes the U.S. is deeply opposed to China’s rise … American strategy toward China, it said, had five objectives: to isolate the country, contain it, diminish it, divide it, and sabotage its political leadership.” The American narrative, as Rudd described it, is hardly more positive about Beijing: “Beijing’s long-term policy is aimed at pushing the U.S. out of Asia altogether and establishing a Chinese sphere of influence spanning the region.”[1] Since about 2008, there has been a sequence of regional and global developments and incidents that have provided fertile soil in which these negative narratives have grown in each of our societies. Among them are: the 2008 financial crisis, incidents in Hong Kong, developments in the south and east China seas, U.S. inability to quickly exit Middle Eastern and Central Asian quagmires, and the confusion in America and elsewhere about where China is headed internally and in terms of its foreign policy. Current Chinese debate over western (universal) values, subversion, and “black hands” unsettles most outside observers, not least Americans. What is happening? If developments continue along the current trajectory, both countries will have progressively less security, at higher cost; the probabilities of intentional, accidental, or catalytic violent confrontations will increase; the world will enjoy less cooperation on transnational issues requiring joint Sino-American efforts; and, economic welfare in both societies will be diminished. What can be done?

#### US-Sino ties key to de-escalate tensions in the *South China Seas*. A B.I.T. is the best step for relations.

Shambaugh ‘15

David Shambaugh is a professor of political science and international affairs at the George Washington University, as well as a non-resident senior fellow at the Brookings Institution. David is regarded inside and outside China as an authority on China's foreign policy, military and security issues and Chinese politics, and has been cited in the state media. He is a regular media commentator, and has acted as an advisor to the United States government and several private foundations and corporations. He was formerly the editor of the China Quarterly, and is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations –“Sino-US relations: Divorce is not an option” – Straits Times - June 12th - http://www.straitstimes.com/opinion/sino-us-relations-divorce-is-not-an-option

Despite this overall macro climate in the relationship, the US and China still have to coexist, and to do so peacefully if at all possible. We have business to do with each other - both commercial and diplomatic business. Perhaps the most immediate opportunity - and one that would give an enormous boost to the relationship - would be the conclusion of a bilateral investment treaty. But negotiating this treaty is hung up in the queue behind the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement. Given the difficulty the White House is having getting that agreement finalised and through Congress, there may be little appetite in Washington to conclude an investment treaty with China this year. Also high on the agenda at present is the real need to forge practical cooperation on a number of so-called "global governance" issues, including North Korea, Iran, the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, Afghanistan, counterterrorism, anti-piracy, climate change, maritime security, economic stability, energy security, sea-lane security, and setting global rules for cyber activity. To date, China has been extremely reluctant to collaborate openly with the US on such global governance issues, but now it possibly seems more feasible. This is because President Xi has personally endorsed more "proactive diplomacy" by China in the global governance arena. This will not solve the problems in US-China relations, but it will help. The upcoming Strategic and Economic Dialogue and Mr Xi's September state visit to Washington are golden opportunities to discuss these issues, try to forge tangible cooperation, and arrest the negative dynamic in the relationship. The question is whether it will be temporary again, or a real "floor" can be put beneath the relationship. If the past is any indicator, we should not expect too much. What worries me is that in this increasingly negative and suspicious atmosphere, "tests of credibility" will increase. The best we can probably hope for over the next two to three years - as President Obama becomes a lame duck and the election cycle stimulates more heated rhetoric about China - is tactical management of the relationship, with sensitivity to each side's "red lines" and "core interests", while hoping that no "wild card" events occur. This could include another military incident in the air or at sea, or renewed tension over Taiwan. Even the current situation in the South China Sea has real potential to haemorrhage, as China is not going to stop its island- building activities and hence will not meet American demands that it do so. Or if China, having fortified the islands, proclaims an air defence identification zone over the South China Sea. What is Washington to do then? The potential for military confrontation is not insignificant. So, looking to the future, the key responsibility for both countries is to learn how to manage competition, keep it from edging towards the conflictual end of the spectrum, while trying to expand the zone of practical cooperation.

#### SCS conflict causes huge death tolls.

Wittner ‘11

(Lawrence S. Wittner, Emeritus Professor of History at the State University of New York/Albany, Wittner is the author of eight books, the editor or co-editor of another four, and the author of over 250 published articles and book reviews. From 1984 to 1987, he edited Peace & Change, a journal of peace research., 11/28/2011, "Is a Nuclear War With China Possible?", [www.huntingtonnews.net/14446](http://www.huntingtonnews.net/14446))

While nuclear weapons exist, there remains a danger that they will be used. After all, for centuries national conflicts have led to wars, with nations employing their deadliest weapons. The current deterioration of U.S. relations with China might end up providing us with yet another example of this phenomenon. The gathering tension between the United States and China is clear enough. Disturbed by China’s growing economic and military strength, the U.S. government recently challenged China’s claims in the South China Sea, increased the U.S. military presence in Australia, and deepened U.S. military ties with other nations in the Pacific region. According to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, the United States was “asserting our own position as a Pacific power.” But need this lead to nuclear war? Not necessarily. And yet, there are signs that it could. After all, both the United States and China possess large numbers of nuclear weapons. The U.S. government threatened to attack China with nuclear weapons during the Korean War and, later, during the conflict over the future of China’s offshore islands, Quemoy and Matsu. In the midst of the latter confrontation, President Dwight Eisenhower declared publicly, and chillingly, that U.S. nuclear weapons would “be used just exactly as you would use a bullet or anything else.” Of course, China didn’t have nuclear weapons then. Now that it does, perhaps the behavior of national leaders will be more temperate. But the loose nuclear threats of U.S. and Soviet government officials during the Cold War, when both nations had vast nuclear arsenals, should convince us that, even as the military ante is raised, nuclear saber-rattling persists. Some pundits argue that nuclear weapons prevent wars between nuclear-armed nations; and, admittedly, there haven’t been very many—at least not yet. But the Kargil War of 1999, between nuclear-armed India and nuclear-armed Pakistan, should convince us that such wars can occur. Indeed, in that case, the conflict almost slipped into a nuclear war. Pakistan’s foreign secretary threatened that, if the war escalated, his country felt free to use “any weapon” in its arsenal. During the conflict, Pakistan did move nuclear weapons toward its border, while India, it is claimed, readied its own nuclear missiles for an attack on Pakistan. At the least, though, don’t nuclear weapons deter a nuclear attack? Do they? Obviously, NATO leaders didn’t feel deterred, for, throughout the Cold War, NATO’s strategy was to respond to a Soviet conventional military attack on Western Europe by launching a Western nuclear attack on the nuclear-armed Soviet Union. Furthermore, if U.S. government officials really believed that nuclear deterrence worked, they would not have resorted to championing “Star Wars” and its modern variant, national missile defense. Why are these vastly expensive—and probably unworkable—military defense systems needed if other nuclear powers are deterred from attacking by U.S. nuclear might? Of course, the bottom line for those Americans convinced that nuclear weapons safeguard them from a Chinese nuclear attack might be that the U.S. nuclear arsenal is far greater than its Chinese counterpart. Today, it is estimated that the U.S. government possesses over five thousand nuclear warheads, while the Chinese government has a total inventory of roughly three hundred. Moreover, only about forty of these Chinese nuclear weapons can reach the United States. Surely the United States would “win” any nuclear war with China. But what would that “victory” entail? A nuclear attack by China would immediately slaughter at least 10 million Americans in a great storm of blast and fire, while leaving many more dying horribly of sickness and radiation poisoning. The Chinese death toll in a nuclear war would be far higher. Both nations would be reduced to smoldering, radioactive wastelands. Also, radioactive debris sent aloft by the nuclear explosions would blot out the sun and bring on a “nuclear winter” around the globe—destroying agriculture, creating worldwide famine, and generating chaos and destruction.